

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,365	06/05/2001	Daniel J. Woodruff	291958 156US	8844
25096 7	590 07/01/2004		EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP		LEADER, WILLIAM T		
PATENT-SEA			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247		1742	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

la.	Application No.	Applicant(s)	M.
•	09/875,365	WOODRUFF ET AL.	1/-
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William T. Leader	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address -	
Period for Reply	EDLY IO OFT TO EVOIDE A M	ONITH(C) EDOM	* .
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute. cause the application to become AB.	ply be timely filed r (30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this communica ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
,	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	4		s is
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	•
Disposition of Claims	· .	* *	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application	ation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit			
5) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-15,17 and 18</u> is/are allowe	d.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19 and 20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) 4 and 16 is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.	,	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection t			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			8
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of:	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	4
1. Certified copies of the priority docu			
2. Certified copies of the priority docu	•		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage	
application from the International B	•	received	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certilled copies not	icocivcu.	
Attachment(s)		3.	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2-11;6-28;12-19-03. 	· · / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4 and 16 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Independent claim 1 recites that first virtual electrode unit is replaced with the second virtual electrode unit. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines "replace" as "to take the place of esp. as a substitute or successor". It is not apparent how the first virtual electrode unit can be replaced with a second unit as required by claim 1 without removing it and installing the second unit as recited in claim 4. Claim 16 includes a similar limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. In claim 19, line 15, the expression "the initial electrochemical processing chamber" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 19, lines 3-5 recite that the electrochemical

Art Unit: 1742

processing chamber initially comprises a replaceable first virtual electrode unit.

Perhaps line 15 should refer to an initial configuration of the chamber rather than an initial chamber. A similar limitation appears in the last paragraph of claim 20.

- 4. The fifth (last) paragraph of claim 19 recites that the virtual electrode unit is moved to a different relative position defined by the second virtual electrode unit. The scope of positions included by this limitation is not clear. The third paragraph of claim 19 recites that the first virtual electrode unit is removed from the reaction vessel. The fourth paragraph recites that the second virtual electrode unit is installed in the reaction vessel. The manner in which the different relative position where the first virtual electrode unit is defined by the second virtual electrode unit is not apparent. This is particularly true since the claim already requires that first virtual electrode unit be removed from the reaction vessel. The most pertinent portions of the specification appear to be paragraphs 0096, 0101 and 0104. However, these sections of the specification do not aid in interpreting the claim language. The last three paragraphs of claim 20 include similar limitations.
- 5. The third and fourth paragraphs of claim 19 include the limitation "without modifying the electrodes". The word "electrodes" is plural. However, it appears that only one electrode has been recited (in line 4). This appears to be inconsistent

Art Unit: 1742

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Poris (5,368,711).
- 8. The Poris patent is directed to a process for the selective electrodeposition of metal onto a workpiece such as a semiconductor wafer. The apparatus used in the process of Poris is shown in figures 9 and 12. The apparatus includes a cell body 10 (processing chamber), an anode electrode 1, and a virtual anode electrode 7 above the electrode and in fluid communication with the electrode as recited in the first paragraph of claim 19. Poris teaches that different virtual anode electrodes can be easily exchanged to optimize the primary current distribution (column 10, lines 49-51). This teaching is considered to meet the limitations of the second, third, and fourth paragraph of claim 19. Poris notes that the exchange may be easily accomplished and does not mention any need to modify anode electrode 1. The fifth paragraph of claim 19 is interpreted to require that the first virtual electrode be at some location outside the reaction vessel. Poris is considered to meet this limitation.

Art Unit: 1742

9. The prior art statements submitted by applicant on 2-11-2002, 6-28-2002 and 12-19-2003 have been reviewed. While the Poris patent is considered to teach the replacement of one virtual anode with anode and anticipate claims 19 and 20 for the reasons given above, the prior art of record is not considered to teach or suggest the combinations of limitations recited in claims 1-18

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William T. Leader whose telephone number is 571-272-1245. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays and alternate Fridays, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William Leader June 23, 2004 ROY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700